JS 44 (Rev. 07/16)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Kai Lyman	According to		DEFENDANTS Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas, Domestic Relations Division, Hon. Margaret Murphy, and Hon. Anne Marie Coyle County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Philadelphia (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known)					
	(CEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA							
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name,)	Address, and Telephone Numbe	0	Not Known					
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)		F PRINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif			
□ 1 U.S. Government □ 3 Federal Question Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party)			(For Diversity Cases O	PTF DEF 1 Incorporated or P of Business In				
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		2 2 Incorporated and of Business In	Another State			
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 Soreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6			
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			FORFEITURE/PENAL	TY BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES			
CONTRACT	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJURY			☐ 375 False Claims Act			
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act	310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product	365 Personal Injury - Product Liability	of Property 21 USC	[20]	376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a))			
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability	367 Health Care/		DD/DDEDTV DICHTE	400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust			
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	320 Assault, Libel & Slander	Pharmaceutical Personal Injury		PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights	410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking			
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act	330 Federal Employers'	Product Liability		☐ 830 Patent	450 Commerce			
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability 340 Marine	☐ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product		840 Trademark	☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and			
Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)	☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product	Liability	LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	Corrupt Organizations			
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle	PERSONAL PROPER	TY 710 Fair Labor Standards Act	861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923)	480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV			
of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	355 Motor Vehicle	371 Truth in Lending	☐ 720 Labor/Management	■ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/			
190 Other Contract	Product Liability	380 Other Personal	Relations	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions			
195 Contract Product Liability	360 Other Personal Injury	Property Damage ☐ 385 Property Damage	☐ 740 Railway Labor Act ☐ 751 Family and Medical	003 K31 (403(g))	☐ 891 Agricultural Acts			
☐ 196 Franchise	362 Personal Injury -	Product Liability	Leave Act		893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information			
AND	Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITION	☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation ☐ 791 Employee Retirement		Act Act			
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation		Habeas Corpus:	Income Security Act	The state of the s	☐ 896 Arbitration			
220 Foreclosure	441 Voting	463 Alien Detainee		or Defendant)	899 Administrative Procedur Act/Review or Appeal of			
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	442 Employment	510 Motions to Vacate Sentence		26 USC 7609	Agency Decision			
☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	443 Housing/ Accommodations	530 General			☐ 950 Constitutionality of			
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	☐ 535 Death Penalty	IMMIGRATION		State Statutes			
	Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	Other: 540 Mandamus & Other	☐ 462 Naturalization Appli ☐ 465 Other Immigration	cation				
	Other	☐ 550 Civil Rights	Actions					
	448 Education	☐ 555 Prison Condition ☐ 560 Civil Detainee -						
		Conditions of		1				
V ODICIN	L. Mario Province del	Confinement						
		Remanded from Appellate Court	Reopened A	ransferred from nother District Decify) — 6 Multidistrict Litigation Transfer	n - Litigation -			
		atute under which you ar	e filing (Do not cite jurisdiction	al statutes unless diversity):				
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON 42 U.S.C. s 1983 Brief description of c	FOR UTE	DUATION M	Z TIL XIV	Amendment			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION	DEMAND \$	-	y if demanded in complaint: D: ⊠Yes □No			
VIII. RELATED CAST	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER	SEP 29 2016			
DATE		SIGNATURE OF ATT	ORNEY OF RECORD	TOO Y	120 SE			
09/29/2016		- June	a de	- C34, 1	120 70			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		V						
RECEIPT # Al	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	OUL	GE MAG, JI	JDGE			
5-10 (Fig. 1) (Fig. 1								

signment to appropriate calendar. Idress of Plaintiff P. O. Box 312 BC	29W MAND	PA 19010
16 N AOCH ST DE		PA 1910 3
ddress of Defendant:	V LLMD L LIVER	1 1100
ace of Accident, Incident or Transaction: (Use Reverse Side Fo	or Additional Space)	9
oes this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation	on and any publicly held corporation owning 1	0% or more of its stock?
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1	(a)) Yes□ No	•×
oes this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□ N	·\$
ELATED CASE, IF ANY:	Date Terminated:	
sse Number: Judge	Date reminated.	
vil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:		
Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within on	e year previously terminated action in this cou	ırt? ✓
	Yes□	Nool
Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a priaction in this court?	or suit pending or within one year previously	A
	Yes□ 1	No
Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any early		previously
terminated action in this court?	Yes□	Nee
Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil r	ights case filed by the same individual?	
is this case a second of successive habeas corpus, seems seem by appearance	Yes□	Nod
VIL: (Place ✔ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)		555
	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:	
Federal Question Cases: □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. □ Insurance Contract and	d Other Contracts
□ FELA	2. □ Airplane Personal Inju	ıry
. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation	
7 T	4. Marine Personal Injury	y
. □ Antitrust	5. □ Motor Vehicle Person	A/2
	6. □ Other Personal Injury	
Labor-Management Relations	7. □ Products Liability	Control of Longing Co.
.X Civil Rights	8. □ Products Liability —	Ashestos
Habeas Corpus	9. □ All other Diversity Ca	
Securities Act(s) Cases		
0. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Flease specify)	
1. □ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify)		
ARBITRATION CE (Check Appropriate		
, counsel of record do hereby of	ertify:	il action case avosed the sum of
□ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge 150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; □ Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	and belief, the damages recoverable in this civ	il action case exceed the sum of
ATE:		
Attorney-at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only i		ney I.D.#
certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending	or within one year previously terminated :	action in this cours 9 2016
ACEPT AS NOTED AS NOT		
Attorney-at-Law Attorney-at-Law	Attorne	ey I.D.#

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Lyman

to the transfer of the total V. Sillington	distribute Husbanu			10	E 10	
PHILADELPHI	A _ :		NO.	16	519	1
FAMILY COU	25/					
In accordance with the Civil Ju	stice Expense and	Delay Reduction	Plan of thi	s court, cou	nsel for	
plaintiff shall complete a Case N	Anagement Track	Designation Form	n in all civil	cases at the	time of	
filing the complaint and serve a c side of this form.) In the even	opy on all delenda t that a defendant	does not agree v	vith the plair	ntiff regardi	ng said	
designation, that defendant shall	, with its first app	earance, submit to	the clerk of	f court and s	erve on	
the plaintiff and all other parties	, a Case Managem	nent Track Design	ation Form	specifying t	ne track	
to which that defendant believes	the case should b	e assigned.				
SELECT ONE OF THE FOLI	OWING CASE	MANAGEMENT	TRACKS:			
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brou	ight under 28 U.S.	C. § 2241 through	n § 2255.		()	
(b) Social Security - Cases requ	esting review of a	decision of the Se	ecretary of H	Health		
and Human Services denying	g plaintiff Social S	Security Benefits.			()	
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.						
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving exposure to asbestos.	claims for persona	il injury or proper	ty damage fr	om	()	
exposure to aspestos.						
(e) Special Management - Case	s that do not fall in	nto tracks (a) thro	ugh (d) that	are		
commonly referred to as cor the court. (See reverse side	nplex and that nee	d special or intens	se managem on of special	ent by		
management cases.)	or this form for a c	detailed explanation	on or special		()	
SEMEN SECTION SERVED SERVED SEEDING		dom vili saje nosta			M	
(f) Standard Management – Cas	ses that do not fall	into any one of th	ie otner traci	KS.	De	
and another consensus servent to 19th			_			
9/79/110			Kuo	, 0	1-t	590
Date	Attorney-at-law		Attorney 1	for ~	9	0
918-490-7987		1		2	200	0
713, [10, 110]		<u>k</u>	ary	nano	guic	art,
Telephone	FAX Number		E-Mail Ac	ldress	C	chy

(Civ. 660) 10/02

CIVIL ACTION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

KAI LYMAN

V.

PHILADELPHIA COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, DOMESTIC RELATIONS DIVISION, THE HONORABLE MARGARET T. MURPHY, ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE, AND HONORABLE ANNE MARIE B. COYLE, TRIAL JUDGE 16 5191

COMPLAINT UNDER 42 U.S.C. § 1983 JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

COMPLAINT

Kai W. Lyman ("Plaintiff") hereby avers as follows as his Complaint against the abovenamed Defendants and may file an amended complaint within the time prescribed by law or rule:

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff brings this action for deprivation of federal rights under the color of state law as an action for money damages, declaratory, and/or injunctive relief brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988, the Fourth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, under the law of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the *Ex Parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123 (1908), doctrine. This action arises from a no-fault divorce involving Plaintiff and Plaintiff's spouse filed in 2012, some two years after the parties' separated, and a support action for child support, alimony, and alimony *pendente lite* (collectively, "support"). Plaintiff has no issue paying support for his children, and the purpose of this action is not any attempt to avoid payment of adequate support, but rather an effort to remedy deleterious effects of the recent deprivations of rights. The orders of Defendants, officials of the Domestic Relations Division ("DRD") of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas, and the constitutional deprivations set

forth therein potentially harm Husband's ability to future earnings to the detriment of himself, his spouse, and their children.

- 2. The DRD entered a series of support enforcement orders intended to compel support payments from an expired, withdrawn settlement offer that Husband had not received after the DRD previously refused three times to compel Plaintiff's signature of the settlement and after it enjoined Plaintiff from accessing his only material asset to pay that same support. At the time of the orders, Husband applied to approximately 100 employment opportunities over approximately one year, consistent with the number of application that are adequate under the standards imposed by Pennsylvania unemployment law and in excess that required by Pennsylvania case law. There was no basis in law or equity for the orders, and Plaintiff was not offered an attorney.
- 3. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated state and federal law in entering orders dated October 29, 2014 and April 21, 2015 seeking to enforce an order of support, which was subject to petitions to modify filed months in advance (April of 2014) of the first October 29, 2014 hearing because of Plaintiff's continuing inability to find employment comparable to that held by him when the orders of support were first entered. The modification petitions, first filed in April of 2014, were not decided until October of 2015, months after the orders complain of herein, and the amended support order dramatically reduced the support payable from October 1, 2014 forward.
- 4. Plaintiff seeks to vindicate the important constitutional rights articulated in the federal and state law, including, without limitation, the requirement that the Court hold full and fair hearings on pending modification petitions before making enforcement orders, hearing the new evidence that was relevant to those topics, and fairly affording an opportunity to reach a

settlement with Plaintiff's former employer when his assets on hand were approximately 10% of the purge factor that the Court ordered, consider the evidence actually presented at the hearing (including the amount of support paid, which is incorrect in the opinions), and the DRD's own injunction preventing compliance with its orders.

PARTIES

- Plaintiff, is an attorney admitted to practice law before the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Plaintiff is currently a resident of City of Philadelphia and has never before commenced litigation in any United States District Court.
- 6. Defendants Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas, Domestic Relations Division, the Honorable Margaret T. Murphy, Administrative Judge, the Honorable Anne Marie B. Coyle are court officials of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas, Domestic Relations Division, and other unidentified officials of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas or other administrative or judicial offices (collectively, "Domestic Relations Division", "DRD," or "Court").

JURISDICTION

7. Jurisdiction is conferred upon this Court by 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343(3) and (4), as this action seeks redress for the violation of Plaintiffs' constitutional and civil rights.

VENUE

- Plaintiffs' claims for declaratory and injunctive relief are authorized by 28 U.S.C.
 §§ 2201 and 2202 and Rule 57 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- 9. Plaintiffs further invoke this Court's supplemental jurisdiction, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a), over any and all state constitutional and state law claims that are so related to the claims within the original jurisdiction of this Court that they form part of the same case or controversy.

10. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391.

JURY DEMAND

11. To the extent allowed by applicable law, Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury in this action on each and every one of their claims.

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

- 12. This action arises from the DRD resolution of claims in child support, alimony, and alimony *pendente lite*.
- 13. The actions and inactions of various officials of the DRD violate clearly established statutory or constitutional rights of which a reasonable person would have known.
- 14. The actions and inactions of the Domestic Relations Court violated the substantive and procedural Due Process rights of Plaintiffs.
- 15. The petition for an enforcement order was issued by DRS, argued by private counsel for Plaintiff's spouse, and no witnesses were called for or by private counsel other than Plaintiff.
- 16. Plaintiff was not offered counsel by the Court, nor provided counsel in violation of state and federal law.
- 17. Plaintiff's request to postpone imposition of the remedy set forth in the October 29, 2014 Order of the DRD was denied in violation of law given Plaintiff's present inability to comply with the orders.
- 18. The Court previously rejected on three separate occasions (on or about November 5, 2013, November 25, 2013, and April 28, 2014), counsel for Wife's requests to compel Plaintiff to accept a settlement agreement from Husband's former employer.

- 19. The Court subsequently imputed the amount of the withdrawn settlement offer as income for purposes of support despite the fact that Husband had not received the confidential settlement, Plaintiff's former employer had withdrawn the settlement, Plaintiff had no other significant assets from which to make support payments, and Plaintiff, despite a reasonable employment search including approximately 100 employment applications within and outside the field of expertise, had not found comparable employment. A few months before the October 2014, one Judge of DRD noted: "I think [Plaintiff] has made substantial efforts to mitigate in the fact that he is trying to get employment It's not like he let things slide. And I think all of us can also recognize that the field for attorneys is not exactly easy at this point"
- 20. Plaintiff's only significant asset, his retirement account from which to make support payments was enjoined by the Court, and Husband promptly petitioned for partial distributions from the account after depleting our resources by making support payments, paying the mortgage on the marital residence, which was listed for sale and subsequently sold at a significant loss, and paying other ordinary living expenses.
- 21. In the days before the October 29, 2014 hearing, the Court denied Husband's application for a partial distribution to pay support obligations, thereby precluding as a matter of law Plaintiff's ability to pay the existing support orders. DRD's injunction against Plaintiff's only significant asset remained on the day of its order, and DRD refused to allow Plaintiff to negotiate with his former employer to obtain a renewed settlement offer from which to pay support.
- 22. The Court, or other officials, subsequently appear to have disclosed confidential medical information regarding Plaintiff, which is protected by law and potentially harms

 Plaintiff's efforts to find other employment and increase his support.

- 23. The October 29, 2014 Order entered by the Court made no finding regarding Plaintiff's present ability to comply with the support order or the purge amount in violation of both state and federal statues, regulations, rules, and caselaw.
- 24. Although the case record of the October 29, 2015 hearing provides "For the record, I am introducing as if set forth in full the full payment history and record of this case number throughout the Clerk of Family Courts. I assume no one has an issue with that. And I'm taking judicial notice when payments were made and when they were not made and the respective balances." However, upon review of the record, Plaintiff could not locate such document, of which this Court must take judicial notice, and Plaintiff submitted support payments provided by PACSES. Plaintiff had in fact paid approximately \$20,000 in support that year alone at the time of the hearing.
- 25. The opinions misstate the county of residence of Plaintiff, as a county other than which jurisdiction would exist for the DRD.
- 26. On or about June 29, 2016, the Court issued a decree approving a no fault divorce and resolving the remaining economic claims and alimony. Although Plaintiff maintained a post office box at a U.S. post office, he never received the Decree. Counsel for Plaintiff's spouse provided a copy of the Decree the day after the appeal period expired, and Plaintiff has filed for permission to appeal *nunc pro tunc*.

COUNT I (Violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983)

- 27. Plaintiff incorporates Paragraphs 1 through 26 as if restated fully herein.
- 28. The conduct of the Defendants in implementing the Plaintiff proximately caused physical, emotional and financial injury to them, as well as serious physical and emotional pain

and suffering. An individual, not the Plaintiff, suffered what appeared to be a significant medical event immediately after the hearing.

- 29. Defendants have acted with deliberate indifference to the constitutional rights of Plaintiff. As a direct and proximate result of the acts as stated herein by each of the Defendants, the Plaintiff's constitutional rights have been violated which has caused them to suffer physical, mental and emotional injury and pain, mental anguish, suffering, humiliation and embarrassment.
- 30. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law and will suffer serious and irreparable harm to their constitutional rights unless Defendants are enjoined, or a declaration entered, from continuing their unlawful policies, practices, and/or customs which have directly and proximately caused such constitutional abuses.
- 31. By their conduct, as described herein, and acting under color of state law to deprive the Plaintiffs of their rights under the Due Process Clause and the Sixth Amendment of U.S. Constitution, the individual Defendants are liable for violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983 which prohibits the deprivation under color of state law of rights secured under the United States Constitution.
- 32. Defendants' actions were taken in retaliation for Plaintiff exercising his assertion of rights protected by federal and state law.
- 33. As a direct and proximate result of the individual Defendants' unlawful actions, Plaintiffs have suffered damages including, physical, mental and emotional injury and pain, mental anguish, suffering, humiliation and embarrassment. Plaintiff seeks injunctive and declaratory relief to remedy the ongoing harm that the Opinions arising from the Orders may cause in the future.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for relief as follows and does not include a specific prayer to compel the return of any sums of child support, alimony, or alimony *pendente lite*, which are fully paid with a credit (and no arrears):

- a. A declaration that Defendants' conduct violated the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution and Plaintiffs' rights under the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's Constitution and state common law in the manners alleged herein, upon consideration of the evidence adduced at trial or otherwise;
- A mandatory injunction requiring that Defendants possessing any information arising from the Orders complained of herein shall collect and deliver to the Plaintiffs all such records and delete all such information from their records;
- c. A mandatory injunction requiring Defendants, and any newly assigned Judges, from engaging in conduct to unlawfully disrupt, disperse, interfere with or prevent the lawful Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendment activities explained of herein or to immediately impose remedies for alleged violations of existing support orders or enforcement orders without making independent fact-finding of the requisite elements, including, without limitation, present ability to comply with any such order and, to the extent required, factual determinations necessary to determine each element of any proposed enforcement order, and to provide counsel if Plaintiff lacks the financial ability to retain one independently;
- e. Award Plaintiffs punitive damages;
- d. Award Plaintiffs compensatory damages and/or attorneys' fees, including, but not limited to any emotional distress, recompensable costs related, and any other compensatory damages as permitted by law and according to proof at trial,
- e. Award attorney's fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988;
- f. Award costs of suit; and
- g. Award such other and further relief as this Court may deem appropriate and equitable, including injunctive and declaratory relief as may be required in the interests of justice.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kai W. Lyman, Esq.

P.O. Box 312

Bryn Mawr, PA 19010

215-480-7987

September 29, 2016

VERIFICATION

I verify that the statements made in this pleading are true and correct to the best of my belief and knowledge. I understand that false statements herein are made subject to the penalties. Sworn to in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

9